



UPGRADED CLAIMS dated November 18, 2006, for APPLICATION #10673866. .

Mr. Steven Brantley;

After the comments that you made about my claims on November 7, 2006, I felt that I had better review their format. And you were right.

The number one claim presented in my Application does not say what the wings look like but would have to be determined by the following dependent claims. Then I realized that the patent wing geometry is unstated since no topside or overall details are described. Except for claim number 5, I left out the fact that the Claims are exclusively about the underside of the wings. A review of the Specification provides ample discussion about shaping the underside of the wings as shown in paragraphs #6, #7, #35, #37, and #47. And the Claims must define only the geometry and relationship of the parts since these are the essence of the patent. In other words, "I goofed."

In addition, a detailed reading of my reference chapter on Claims also has a statement that "Every part and feature in every claim is shown in the drawings and discussed in the specification." Actually, there is only a single preferred wing underside shape illustrated in every drawing in the application although variations are described in the Specification in paragraphs #5, #6, #9, #40, #56, and #66. "Goofed again."

My "Patent It Yourself" reference also states,

Claims define the structure, or acts, of an invention.

Claims recite the bounds or scope of an invention whereas the specification must teach how to make and use the invention.

Claims are a precise description of the elements of the invention, distinctly claiming the subject matter.

The original claim in the Application is included here, followed by a series of four replacement claims with different wording.

The variations are in the independent claim, leaving the dependent claims unchanged. The underside of the wings defines their distinctive character and where they are attached. The two dependent claims broaden the independent claim by expanding their scope but not describing their function. The following 'whereby' statement has been changed to eliminate the function, 'dynamic roll stability,' as listed in the original Claim.

I am not too familiar with the choice of words in claims, so I am requesting that the patent office be the deciding body to select one of my versions or to offer some equivalent claims.

*Edward Linsley*